



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,177	11/25/2003	Jun Nakamura	US-110	6388
38108 7590 01/30/2009 CERMAK & KENEALY LLP ACS LLC 515 EAST BRADDOCK ROAD SUITE B ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER RAMIREZ, DELIA M	
			ART UNIT 1652	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/30/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/720,177

**Applicant(s)**

NAKAMURA ET AL.

**Examiner**

DELIA M. RAMIREZ

**Art Unit**

1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DELIA M. RAMIREZ.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Shelly Guest Cermak.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: claims 12, 18 and proposed 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative requested clarification of the reasons why claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 112 first and second paragraphs. Proposed claim 22 was discussed and the Examiner provided suggestions as to how to overcome potential rejections if this claim were to be submitted for examination on the merits.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Delia M. Ramirez/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652